IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.04.2006

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. KULASEKARAN

Second Appeal No. 1724 of 2000
and
C.M.P. No. 16240 of 2000

Kandasamy .. Appellant

Versus

1. Selvambal
2. Jayaraman .. Respondents

Second appeal under Section 100 CPC against the decree and judgment dated 30.06.2000 made in A.S. No. 104 of 1999 on the file of Additional Subordinate Judge, Villupuram reversing the decree and judgment dated 22.10.1998 made in O.S. No. 615 of 1996 on the file of Principal District Munsif Court, Villupuram.

For Appellant : Mr. V. Raghavachari
For Respondents : Ms. S. Geetha
for Mr. R. Balakrishnan for R1
No appearance for R2

JUDGMENT

The second defendant in O.S. No. 615 of 1996 on the file of Principal District Munsif Court, Villupuram is the appellant in this second appeal. The said suit has been filed by the Plaintiff/first respondent herein praying for (i) directing the petitioner to sue as an indigent person; (ii) directing the 1st respondent to pay a sum of Rs.1,000/- per month towards maintenance by creating a charge over B Schedule Described property (iii) directing the first respondent to pay Rs.18,000/- towards arrears of maintenance with a charge over the B Schedule properties; and (iv) directing the first respondent to pay the court fee payable on the plaint to the Government and for costs. The trial court dismissed the suit and on appeal, the first appellate court set aside the decree and judgment of the trial court, hence the present second appeal.

2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as they were arrayed before the trial court.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

3. The case of the plaintiff/first respondent herein, as set out in the plaint are as follows:-

The suit was filed as a pauper. The marriage between the Plaintiff and the first defendant was solemnised at Ezhu Sembon Village 40 years ago and they lived happily as husband and wife for a period of ten years; that out of the said wedlock, two female daughters namely Mahalakshmi and Mangalakshmi were born; that thereafter, the first defendant developed illicit intimacy with one Manonmani and drove the plaintiff and her daughters out of the matrimonial home; that the plaintiff went to her mother's house at Sompet Village and lived there along with her daughters; that she maintained herself and her daughters by doing manual labour work in the fields; that both the daughters had a premature death due to poverty; that the plaintiff was unable to maintain herself and her aged mother; that the plaintiff was aged and she could not even do labour work and she needed financial support for maintenance of her life; that the first respondent also had illicit intimacy with one Mangai and out of the said relationship, four sons were born; that her husband, the first defendant is possessed of 5 acres of agricultural land and house and he has been earning Rs.50,000/- per annum out of the said lands; that the plaintiff required Rs.1,000/- per month towards food, clothing and shelter and the first defendant is bound to pay the said amount; that the plaintiff is also entitled to claim past arrears for a period of three years, however, restricted it to Rs.18 months, which works out to Rs.18,000/- payable by the first defendant; that the first defendant, in order to defeat the rights of the plaintiff was attempting to sell the immovable property to the second defendant, hence, he was also impleaded as a party in the suit.

4. The first defendant has not chosen to contest the suit. He neither filed written statement nor participated in the trial, hence he was set exparte.

5. The second defendant has contested the suit by filing written statement stating that he was unnecessarily impleaded as a party to the suit; that the 'B' Schedule described property shown in the plaint was purchased by him on 16.02.1996 for a valid sale consideration of Rs.27,000/- from the first defendant and ever since the said purchase, he is in possession and enjoyment of the same; that the first defendant had sold the said property to settle the debts incurred towards performance of the marriage of his daughters Mahalakshmi and Mangalakshmi; that even before the institution of the suit, he had purchased the property from the first defendant; that there are other properties owned and possessed by the first defendant, but the plaintiff has sought to create a charge only in the property purchased by him and prayed for dismissal of the suit.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

6. Before the trial court, the plaintiff has marked Ex.A1 and A2 and examined herself as PW1. On the side of the second defendant, Exs. B1 to B5 were marked, the second defendant examined himself as DW1, one Sarangapani, Ganesan and Dhandapani were examined as DWs 2 to 4 respectively.

7. The trial court considering the oral and documentary evidence found that the suit was instituted on 29.01.1996; that the plaintiff has not issued any notice to the first defendant prior to filing the suit; that even prior to the filing of the suit, the second defendant had entered into sale agreement, Ex.B1 dated 10.10.1995 to purchase the B Schedule described property from the first defendant and sale deed, Ex.B2 dated 16.02.1996 was obtained for a valid consideration and in order to prove the same, the second defendant had examined DWs 2 and 3, who have deposed about the execution of Ex.B1, sale agreement; that there is no oral or documentary evidence to show that she was living separately to grant the relief of maintenance sought for by the plaintiff and dismissed the suit.

8. Aggrieved by the decree and judgment of the trial court, the plaintiff has filed A.S. No. 104 of 1999 before the Additional Subordinate Judge, Villupuram and the first appellate Court on consideration of the oral and documentary evidence found that in Ex.B2, it is seen that the first defendant had executed the same as a Guardian for the minor daughters Mahalakshmi and Mangalakshmi; that the first defendant has not chosen to contest the suit and therefore the trial court ought to have allowed the claim of the plaintiff for maintenance and the finding of the trial court that there is no oral or documentary evidence to prove the claim of maintenance is untenable; the first appellate Court relied on Section 18 (2) of Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, hereinafter called as the Act, wherein it is stated that a Hindu wife, whether married before or after the commencement of this Act, shall be entitled to be maintained by her husband during her life time. A Hindu wife shall be entitled to live separately from her husband without forfeiting her claim to maintenance, if he is guilty of desertion or treated her with such cruelty and came to a conclusion that the plaintiff is entitled to maintenance from the first defendant; that in Ex.B1, agreement of sale, it is found mentioned that a sum of Rs.6,000/- was received as advance but the same was not found mentioned in Ex.B2, sale deed; that Ex.B1, agreement of sale was written in a white paper instead of stamp paper and suspected its credibility and came to a conclusion that Ex.B2 is not reliable; that the sale transaction between the first and second defendant is hit by the principles of lispendence as contemplated under Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act and allowed the first appeal.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

9. Mr. Raghavachari, learned counsel appearing for the appellant/second defendant submits that the doctrine of lispendence is not applicable to the case on hand; that Ex.B1, sale agreement dated 10.10.1995 was entered into prior to file of the suit; that Exs. B3 to B5 clearly proves that the second defendant herein had discharged the loan amount of the first defendant and in order to repay the same, the property was sold to the second defendant under Ex.B2, sale deed dated 16.02.1996; that there are other properties owned and possessed by the first defendant, but the plaintiff has chosen only to create a charge in the B schedule described property, which was purchased by the second defendant in collusion with the first defendant; that the provisions of Section 52 of the Transfer of Property has no application to the case on hand; that the evidence of DWs 1 to 4 reveals that the B schedule described property was sold to the second defendant prior to receipt of summons in the suit and the second defendant is in possession of the same and prayed for setting aside the decree and judgment of the first appellate Court.

10. In support of this contention, the learned counsel for the appellant relied on the below mentioned decisions:-

i) (Pavayammal and another vs. Samiappa Goundan and others) AIR (34) 1947 Madras 376 wherein in para-2 it was stated thus:-

> "2. In the first place, it cannot be said of the plaintiffs that they have got a right to receive maintenance 'from the profits of immovable property' when only s.39, will come into play. Secondly, mere knowledge of the legal right would not appear to be enough as, if it were so, there could be no sale by a husband of his properties to third parties without the risk f wife turning up later and saying that they had notice of her right and that therefore the transferee were bound to recognise her right. What the section contemplates is a claim based on the right to receive maintenance and notice of such claim."

ii) (Puppala Ramamurthi v. Kandulapati Kanakaratnam and others) AIR (35) 1948 Madras 208 wherein in para-8, it was held thus:-

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

> "8. After setting out Section 39 as it stood before the amendment, the learned Judges point out that it was

amended in 1929 so as to eliminate the necessity of proving the intention to defeat the right of maintenance and that all that a person having a right to receive maintenance has now to prove is that the transferee has notice of such right or that the transfer is gratuitous..... The only effect of the amendment of S.39 is to make it unnecessary for the widow to prove that the transfer was made with the intention of defeating her right. If the transfer is gratuitous, there is nothing for her to prove beyond her right to receive maintenance. If, on the other hand, the transfer is for consideration, she has only to prove, besides her right to receive maintenance that the transferee had notice of her right...."

iii) (Rangasamy Gounder vs. Murugan and three others) AIR 1983 TNLJ 111 wherein it is stated thus:-

"The Plaintiff filed the present suit on 26.10.1972 and it was disposed of on 20.04.1978. The Court auction sale was on 25.02.1976. Learned counsel for the appellant contended that as the Court auction purchase was during the pendency of the plaintiff's suit, the sale is hit by lispendens under Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act and it is void and no title can pass in favour of the defendant. In support of this contention, learned counsel relied on a decision of the Allahabad High Court reported in AIR 1981 Allahabad 149. As pointed out by the Supreme Court in the decision reported in 1959 SCR page 878, 'that the doctrine of lis pendens applies only to a transfer pendente lite, but it cannot affect a pre-existing right and if the sale is a transfer in recognition of a pre-existing debt and subsisting right, it would not be affected by the doctrine, as the transfer does not create a new right pendente lite. What is prohibited under Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act is the creation of a new right and the transfer was in recognition of a pre-existing and subsisting right, such a transfer is not hit by Section 52 of

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

the Transfer of Property Act.....

11. Per contra, Ms. Geetha, learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff/first respondent herein submits that first appellate Court, on consideration of the oral and documentary evidence has rightly held that the plaintiff is entitled to maintenance as the first defendant was set exparte and he has not chosen to contest the case; that the second defendant has purchased the B Schedule property knowing fully well the entitlement of the plaintiff and her daughters over the same and therefore the suit is clearly governed by the principles of lispendence and the first appellate Court as rightly decided the said issue and prayed for dismissal of the second appeal.

12. The learned counsel for the first respondent relied on the below mentioned decisions in support of her contention:-

i) (Chenchulakshmi vs. Janardan Singh and others) 2000 I MLJ 349, wherein in para-17 it was held thus:-

> "17. ....Sec.52 of the Transfer of Property Act where any suit or proceeding is pending with reference to a property, which is directly and specifically in question, the property cannot be transferred or otherwise dealt with by any party to the suit or proceeding so as to affect the rights of any other party thereto under any decree or order which may be made therein, except under the authority of the Court and on such terms as may impose. Therefore, there is no scope for purchaser of property pendente lite to contend that he is a bonafide purchaser for value without notice or to say that he was not aware of the proceeding and had no notice of the pendency of the proceeding. It has become necessary that in his evidence, PW1 would say that he was not aware of the pendency of the proceedings and had no notice. Even assuming for a moment that the evidence tendered by him is true, even then that will not save him from the tentacles of Sec.52 of the Transfer of Property Act. Equally, the contention that property was purchased paying valuable consideration, is of no avail since Sec.52 of the Transfer of Property Act does not purport to exclude purchaser of the property from value from its operation. On the other hand, this

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

section is emphatic in its terms that the property cannot be transferred or otherwise dealt with by any party to the suit except under the authority of the Court and on such terms as it may impose...."

13. The Plaintiff/respondent herein has filed the suit on 29.01.1996 as in forma pauperis for monthly maintenance of Rs.1,000/-, past arrears of Rs.18,000/- praying to have her maintenance made a charge on suit immovable property and directing the first defendant to pay the court fee payable by her. She has also sent a notice, Ex.A1 dated 14.02.1996 to the Anniyur Sub-registrar mentioning the details of the suit and requested not to register any deed pertaining to the suit property. Ex.A2 dated 15.02.1996 is the communication sent by the Sub-registrar, Anniyur to the plaintiff.

14. The trial court considering the oral and documentary evidence found that the suit was instituted on 29.01.1996; that the plaintiff has not issued any notice to the first defendant prior to filing the suit; that even prior to the filing of the suit, the second defendant had entered into sale agreement, Ex.B1 dated 10.10.1995 to purchase the B Schedule described property from the first defendant and obtained sale deed, Ex.B2 dated 16.02.1996 for a valid consideration and in order to prove the same, the second defendant had examined DWs 2 and 3, who have deposed about the execution of Ex.B1, sale agreement; that there is no oral or documentary evidence to show that she was living separately to grant the relief of maintenance sought for by the plaintiff and dismissed the suit.

15. The first appellate Court, after elaborate discussion found that the plaintiff and the first defendant married about 40 years prior to the filing of the suit, lived together for 10 years and out of the said wedlock, two daughters Mahalakshmi and Mangalakshmi were born; that thereafter, the first defendant developed illicit intimacy with one Manonmani and drove the plaintiff and her daughters from the matrimonial home, hence, the plaintiff along with her daughters went to Sompet village and lived with her mother; that the plaintiff maintained herself and her daughters by doing coolie work; that her daughters died after marriage; that the first defendant owns 5 acres of land and house and earns a sum of Rs.50,000/- per annum and prayed for maintenance at the rate of Rs.1,000/- per month since she is residing separately. Considering the above said facts, the first appellate Court set aside the finding of the trial court that the plaintiff has not proved that she is living separately. The said conclusion arrived at by the first appellate Court is based on valid evidence and the same is hereby confirmed.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

16. The Plaintiff prayed for arrears of maintenance and future maintenance from the first defendant, confining to the period of 18 months. The first appellate Court relied on Sec. 18 (2) of the Act wherein it is stated that a Hindu wife, whether married before or after the commencement of this Act, shall be entitled to be maintained by her husband during her life time. A Hindu wife shall be entitled to live separately from her husband without forfeiting her claim to maintenance, if he is guilty of desertion or treated her with such cruelty and awarded the maintenance arrears as sought for by the plaintiff. In this case, the first defendant deserted the plaintiff and living with a concubine, hence, the finding of the first appellate Court that the plaintiff is entitled to maintenance arrears and future maintenance is valid.

17. In so far as the fixation of maintenance and arrears are concerned, Section 23 (1) of the Act contemplates that it shall be in the discretion of the Court to determine whether any, and if so what, maintenance shall be awarded under the provisions of this Act, and in doing so the Court shall have due regard to the considerations set out in sub-section (2) or sub-section (3), as the case may be, so far as they are applicable. Following the above provision of law and taking into consideration of the status of the parties, the first appellate Court has rightly determined the maintenance at Rs.1000/- per month payable by the first defendant to the plaintiff and calculated arrears at Rs.18,000/- for 18 months.

18. The plea of collusion between the plaintiff and the first defendant, advanced by the second defendant was also rightly rejected by the first appellate Court on consideration of oral and documentary evidence.

19. Now, I have to decide whether Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act can be made applicable to the facts of the case on hand or not. Admittedly, after filing the suit, the second defendant purchased the suit property under sale deed, Ex.B2 dated 16.02.1996. After filing the suit, the plaintiff sent notice, Ex.A1 dated 14.02.1996 to the Sub-registrar, Anniyur, who also sent a reply notice dated Ex.A2 dated 15.02.1996, which are prior to Ex.B2, sale deed. Though Ex.B1, sale agreement said to have came into existence on 10.10.1995, the details of the same were not found mentioned in Ex.B2, sale deed and the plaintiff sought for a charge on the suit property.

20. In this context, it will be useful to refer to the decisions of the Honourable Supreme Court and a judgment of the Division Bench of this Court, which are as follows:-

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

i) (Nagubai Ammal and others vs. B. Sharma Rao and others) AIR 1956 Supreme Court 593, wherein in Para No.9, it was stated thus:-

> "9. On this question, as the plaint in OS No. 100 of 1919-20 praying for a charge was presented on 6-6-1919, the sale to Dr Nanjunda Rao subsequent thereto on 30-1-1920 would prima facie fall within the mischief of Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act, and would be hit by the purchase by Devamma on 2-8-1928 in execution of the charge decree.
>
> Sri K.S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, learned counsel for the appellants, did not press before us the contention urged by them in the courts below that when a plaint is presented in forma pauperis the lis commences only after it is admitted and registered as a suit, which was in this case on 17-6-1920, subsequent to the sale under Exhibit VI — a contention directly opposed to the plain language of the Explanation to Section 52. And he also conceded and quite rightly, that when a suit is filed for maintenance and there is a prayer that it be charged on specified properties, it is a suit in which right to immovable property is directly in question, and the lis commences on the date of the plaint and not on the date of the decree, which creates the charge...."

ii) (Muthulakshmi vs. A.R. Sahasranamam and others) AIR 1974 Madras 89 wherein in Para-2, it was held thus:-

> "2. In our opinion, the sale dated 20.08.1958 and the subsequent sale dated 08.02.1960 can operate only subject to the eventual result of O.S. No. 145 of 1958. These two sales were by private treaty and effected by the father after his daughter had instituted the suit for maintenance. Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act clearly states that the property in suit cannot be transferred or otherwise dealt with during the pendency of the suit by any party thereto or proceeding so as to affect the rights of any other party thereto under any decree or order which may be made therein, except under the authority of the Court and on such

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

> terms as it may impose. The Courts have uniformly held that a voluntary sale or a sale by private treaty will be hit by Section 52 whatever the position may be with regard to sales in invitum. Though it is true that the sale made to the appellant-plaintiff would not be invalid, it cannot prevail against the decree in O.S. No 145 of 1958, and, therefore, against the Court sale held in execution of that decree. Seetharamanujacharyulu v. Venkata-subbamma, 59 Mad LJ 485, appears to be on all fours with the case on hand. Once a charge is granted by a decree of Court, it takes effect from the date of the plaint and another sale subsequent to the date of the plaint will naturally be subject to lis pendens, and any conveyance during the pendency of the suit which includes execution proceedings, cannot prevail over the Court sale held in execution of the charge decree. In Seetharamanuja-charyulu v. Venkatasubbamma, 59 Mad LJ 485 = (AIR 1930 Mad 824), it was held that in circumstances almost similar to those in the present case, Court auction purchase must prevail. We, therefore, hold that the sale held in execution of the decree is valid and the sale in favour of the plaintiff-appellant cannot prevail over it."

21. The above said two decisions makes it clear that if the sale is effected after the suit was filed for maintenance, it is hit by the provisions of Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act which contemplates that property in suit cannot be transferred or otherwise dealt with during the pendency of the suit by any party thereto or proceeding so as to affect the rights of any other party thereto under any decree or order which may be made therein, except under the authority of the Court and on such terms as it may impose.

22. It is argued by the learned counsel for the second defendant/appellant that the appellant purchased the property without notice since the summons were served only subsequent to execution of Ex.B2, sale deed. It cannot be forgotten that the plaintiff, though not sent notice to the second defendant, issued a notice, Ex.A1 dated 14.02.1996 to the Sub-registrar, Anniyur, having jurisdiction over the suit property stating that she has filed the suit for maintenance and the same is pending. On receipt of the same, the Sub-registrar, Anniyur sent a reply, Ex.A2 dated 15.02.1996 to the plaintiff wherein it

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

is stated that the plaintiff has filed an application for interim injunction, however, the sale deed, Ex.B2 for which stamps were purchased on 16.02.1996 and the same was registered only on 19.02.1996.

23. It is the case of the second defendant that to discharge the loan borrowed by the plaintiff and the first defendant for performance of the marriage of their daughters, the suit property was sold to him. The said allegation of the second defendant was denied by the plaintiff in her evidence stating that the loan amount was not borrowed by the first defendant for performance of marriage of his daughters, but she alone spent for the marriage of her first daughter and her second daughter had a love marriage.

24. It is canvassed by the second defendant that he purchased the suit property without notice, hence, he is protected under Section 39 of Transfer of Property Act. Section 39 of the Transfer of Property Act does not apply to a case where a charge has been created and the decree provides that in the event of non-payment the amount can be realised by enforcing the charge. In the this context, it will be useful to refer the decision reported in (Mahesh Prasad vs. Mt. Mundar) AIR (38) (FB) 1951 Allahabad 141 wherein the Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court held in para No. 19 thus:-

> "19. ..... The Section was substantially amended by the Amending Act XX (20) of 1929 and the words 'with the intention of defeating such rights' after the word 'transferred' were omitted and the words 'of such intention' after the word 'notice' were replaced by the word 'thereof'. This section relates to a case where no charge has been created but a person had a right to receive maintenance from the profits of immovable property. The section was amended to give better protection to a person entitled to receive maintenance as it was difficult to prove under the old section that an improvident alienation was affected with the intention of defeating the rights of the person entitled to maintenance. The argument of learned counsel for the appellant is that even under S.39 a transferee for consideration but without notice is protected, and there is therefore no reason why the appellant should be in a worse position than a transferee is under S.39. Section 39 does not apply to a

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

> case where a charge has been created and the decree provides that in the event of non-payment the amount can be realised by enforcing the charge. To my mind, s.39 T.P. Act is not relevant to this case and it need not be considered any further."

25. In a question in the cross-examination, the plaintiff stated that the second defendant is not a bonafide purchaser and she prayed for a charge in the suit property since it was unsold property of the first defendant. Moreover, in Ex.B2, sale deed, the details of the loan amount borrowed by the first defendant were not mentioned. In Exs. B3 to B5, the discharge pronotes, it is mentioned that the loan amount was borrowed by the first defendant to meet his personal expenses. In a question in the cross-examination, the second defendant/appellant replied that the first defendant own other properties but he has not let in evidence furnishing the details of the alleged other properties owned by the first defendant. Since the second defendant has not furnished the details of the other properties owned by the first defendant in his evidence, the averment that the plaintiff has deliberately proceeded against the property which was sold to him cannot be accepted.

26. It is an admitted fact that the plaintiff has not sent any notice to the second defendant. The suit summons were served on the defendants on 24.02.1996 i.e., after execution of Ex.B2, sale deed dated 16.02.1996. It is claimed by the second defendant that sale agreement, Ex.B1 was entered into between him and the first defendant as early as 10.10.1995, which was also attested by Dws 2 and 3, but admittedly the details of the sale agreement, Ex.B1 were not mentioned in the sale deed, Ex.B2. Even the advance of Rs.6,000/- paid on the date of Ex.B1 was not mentioned in Ex.B2. Moreover, Ex.B1 was not written in stamp paper but only in white paper and revenue stamp is affixed thereon. The first appellate Court found that Ex.B1 is not a valid document since it was executed in white paper and revenue stamps were affixed and the reason for execution of Ex.B1, sale agreement in white paper is it could be easily anti-dated to suit the convenience as if it was executed prior to filing of the suit and to forestall the claim of the plaintiff. The said finding of the first appellate Court that Ex.B1, sale agreement is untrustworthy is perfectly valid.

27. The doctrine of lis pendens does apply to a suit for maintenance by a Hindu wife in which she claimed to have her maintenance made a charge on specific immovable property and a decree is passed granting a charge on such property, in such cases, the right of immovable property is directly and specifically in question. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that the findings of the

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

first appellate Court that the transaction made under Ex.B2, sale deed is hit by Section 52 of Transfer of Property Act is perfectly valid.

28. In view of the discussion made above on various issues, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the well considered decree and judgment of the first appellate Court and accordingly the same is confirmed. The second appeal is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected CMP is closed.

rsh

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To

1. The Additional Subordinate Judge
   Sub-court
   Villupuram

2. The Principal District Munsif
   District Munsif Court
   Villupuram

3. The Section Officer
   Vernacular Records Section
   High Court of Madras
   Madras - 600 104

+ one cc to Mr. R. Balakrishnan, Advocate sr no. 21214

MKJ(CO)
NM(16.05.2006)

in S.A. No. 1724 of 2000

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/